

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 24, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1 through 21 and 23 have been amended to more clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 24 through 40 have been cancelled without prejudice, and new claims 41-54 are introduced. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1 through 23 and 41 through 54, including independent claims 1, 14, 41, 45, and 49 through 54 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

*The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16, 18-25, 27-30, 32-35, and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,992,995 of Agrawal et al. (the "Agrawal" reference). Applicants urge that this ground for rejection is traversed because Agrawal fails to expressly teach every recited limitation of independent claims 1 and 14 and new independent claims 41, 45, and 49 through 54.*

Following the present amendment, independent claim 1, upon which claims 2 through 13 are dependent, recites a method for handing over a connection of a mobile entity from a first network access entity to a second network access entity, wherein a global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. The

method includes sending a message including information for identifying the first network access entity from the mobile entity to the second network access entity, which enables the second network entity to direct traffic destined to the first network entity.

Following the present amendment, independent claim 14, upon which claims 15 through 23 are dependent, recites a method for handing over a connection of a mobile entity from a first network access entity to a second network access entity, wherein a global address of the second network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. The recited method includes sending a message including information for identifying the second network access entity from the mobile entity to the first network access entity, which enables the first network access entity to direct traffic to the second network access entity.

New independent claim 41, upon which claims 42 through 44 are dependent, recites a mobile entity of network system that includes a first network access entity and a second network access entity. In the network system, a global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. Furthermore, the mobile entity is configured to send a message including information for identifying the first network access entity to the second network access entity which enables the second network access entity to direct traffic to the first network access entity.

New independent claim 45, upon which claims 46 through 48 are dependent, recites a mobile entity of a network system includes a first network access entity and a

second network access entity. A global address of the second network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. The mobile entity is configured to send a message including information for identifying the second network access entity to the first network access entity, which enables the first network access entity to direct traffic to the second network access entity.

New independent claim 49 recites a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium, and the computer readable medium storing computer executable instructions configured to control a processor to perform a method. This method includes sending a message including information for identifying a first network access entity from a mobile entity to a second network access entity, which enables the second network entity to direct traffic destined to the first network entity. A global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity.

New independent claim 50 recites a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium, and the computer readable medium storing computer executable instructions configured to control a processor to perform a method that includes sending a message including information for identifying a second network access entity from a mobile entity to a first network access entity to enables the first network entity to direct traffic destined to the second network entity. A global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity.

New independent claim 51 recites a first network access entity configured to receive a message from a mobile entity. The message includes information for

identifying a second network access entity to the first network access entity, wherein a global address of the second network access entity is not known to the mobile entity, and wherein said message enables the first network entity to direct traffic to the second network access entity.

New independent claim 52 recites a mobile entity of network system that includes a first network access entity and a second network access entity, where a global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. The mobile entity includes sending means for sending a message including information for identifying the first network access entity to the second network access entity which enables the second network access entity to direct traffic to the first network access entity.

New independent claim 53 recites a mobile entity of a network system that includes a first network access entity and a second network access entity, where a global address of the second network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. The mobile entity comprises sending means for sending a message including information for identifying the second network access entity to the first network access entity, which enables the first network access entity to direct traffic to the second network access entity.

New independent claim 54 recites a first network access entity that includes receiving means for receiving a message from a mobile entity. The message includes information for identifying a second network access entity to the first network access entity. A global address of the second network access entity is not known to the mobile

entity, and the message enables the first network entity to direct traffic to the second network access entity.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Agrawal and believe that it neither teaches nor suggests all of the recited features of claim 1 and 14 and new independent claims 41, 45, and 49 through 54. As described in its abstract, Agrawal relates to:

Methods and systems are provided for facilitating intra-domain mobility. A first network or domain includes a home agent or SIP proxy of a mobile node. A second network includes two or more subnetworks and at least one mobility agent (MA). Each subnetwork includes an associated subnet agent. To communicate, the mobile node first registers with a subnet agent, receives a local care-of-address and a global care-of-address, and then registers with an MA. The mobile node may then provide the global care-of-address to the home agent. The local care-of-address may enable communication with the mobile node without determining a specific route to the mobile node. The global care-of-address received from the subnet agent may include the address of the MA. Accordingly, the mobile node may transition from any of the subnetworks to another subnetwork without communicating to the home agent information about the transition and without communicating to the MA information about a security association between the mobile node and the home agent.

According to this and other disclosure in Agrawal, the reference discloses methods and systems for facilitating intra-domain mobility. In the remark given in bold letters and the end of the first paragraph of page 3, the Office Action describes that Agrawal discusses identifying and authenticating a mobile node in a foreign network. However, this is not a specific recited feature of independent claim 1.

Similarly, as shown in Figure 2 and also described in the abstract, and in col. 8, ll. 52 to 62, a network system 200 comprising a home network 210, a correspondent network 220 and a foreign network 240 are described. The foreign network 240

comprises a plurality of subnetworks 250, 260. In the passage in column 8, lines 39 to 51, handovers also are described wherein Agrawal distinguishes between handovers between different cells than the same subnetwork and handovers between two different domains or networks. For example, the passages cited in the Office Action at lines 60 to 67 of col. 1, lines 9 to 13 of col. 7, and lines 39 to 51 of col. 8 describe intra-domain handovers. However, these passages identified in the Office Action do teach or suggest elements of Agrawal corresponding to the first and second network access entities recited in independent claim 1. For at least this reason, Agrawal does not teach every recited limit of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed.

Continuing with claim 1, Applicants further note that an object of various recited embodiments of the present application is to provide mobility support even in case the global address of one or even both of the participating network access entities is not known to a mobile entity. For example, claim 1 recites that a global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. In addressing this recitation, the Office Action refers to Agrawal at the abstract and at lines 41 to 67 of col. 4, lines 1 to 12 and 26 to 37 of col. 5, lines 9 to 19 of col. 7, and lines 55 to 67 of col. 9. However, Applicants have carefully reviewed these passages and find that they do not teach or suggest that the global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity, as recited in claim 1. From the abstract, lines 6 to 8, Applicants note that a mobile node first registers with so-called subnet agent of each subnetwork (within the network 240). From this subnet agent, the mobile node receives a local care-of-address

and a global care-of-address, thereby enabling the mobile node to register with a mobility agent (MA). Since the mobile node first registers with the subnet agent, only this element could correspond to the recite network access entities of claim 1, even though this connection appears to be convoluted, at best. For at least this reason, Agrawal does not teach at least this recitation of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed on this addition grounds.

Moreover, there are no indications in Agarwal that the address of this subnet agent is indeed not known to the mobile node, as recited in claim 1. Regarding this recited claim limitation, Applicants have reviewed the passages identified in the Office Action and strongly urge that they do not teach that an address of one of the network access entities is not known to the mobile node, as described above. For at least this reason, Agrawal does not teach at least this recitation of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed on this addition grounds.

Likewise, Applicants note that Agrawal does not teach or suggested the recited limit from claim 1 that the mobile entities send information for identifying one of the network access entities to the other network access entity. Regarding this recitation, the Office Action references col. 5, lines 49 to 59, and col. 11, lines 3 to 12. However, Applicants have reviewed these passages and find that they do not relate to the recitations of claim 1. Instead, the passages only describe that a care-of-address of the particular mobile node is not known. For at least this reason, Agrawal also does not teach at least

this recitation of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed on this addition grounds.

Under similar grounds, Applicants therefore urge that the rejection of claim 14 is likewise traversed on similar grounds and that new independent claims 41, 45, and 49 through 54 are similarly allowable because these independent claims include similar claim features as those recited in independent claim 1, although of different scope, and because the Office Action refers to similar portions of the cited references to reject the other independent claims. Applicants likewise believe that claims 2-13, 15-24, 42-44, and 46-48 should likewise be allowable as depending from allowable claims for at least the reason presented above. It is therefore urged that this ground for rejection is traversed.

#### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

*The Office Action rejects claims 12, 17, 31, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Agrawal in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20030086425 of Bearden et al. (the "Bearden" reference). Applicants urge that this ground for rejection is traversed because the combination of Agrawal and Bearden fails to expressly teach every recited limitation of independent claims 1 and 14 and new independent claims 41, 45, and 49 through 54, and therefore, fails to expressly teach every recited limitation of claims 12, 17, 31, and 36 since the dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base independent claims.*



As described in its abstract, Bearden generally relates to:

A system for monitoring traffic on a network first discovers the network so as to map the various devices and links in the network. Statistics are then gathered from various points in the network relating to quality of service, and especially loads on the network devices. Synthetic calls are generated at selected points of the network while monitoring the network. This data is then stored and displayed in a manner that is easy for the operator to analyze, with more detailed displays being available through the use of a mouse or keystrokes.

As seen in the abstract and other disclosure, Bearden generally relates to a system for monitoring traffic on a network, wherein several parameters regarding quality of service and the like can be monitored. In this way, it can be seen that Bearden does not address the above-described deficiencies in Agrawal. Similarly, Bearden is silent regarding the technical problems and advantages underlying the present application. For example, Bearden does not address the recitation from claim 1 that mobile entities send information for identifying one of the network access entities to the other network access entity. Consequently, the independent claims 1, 14, 41, 45, and 49-54 are allowable over the combination of Agrawal and Bearden, and claims 12 and 17 and new claims 44 and 46 (corresponding to cancelled claims 31 and 36) are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Moreover, even if claims 1, 14, 41, and 45 continue to be rejected in view of Agrawal, claims 12, 17, 44 and 46 should be separately allowable because Bearden fails

to teach or suggest the recited limitations contained therein. Specifically, the monitoring of the network according to Bearden is performed in order to improve the quality of service, but there is no suggestion that this could be used in order to identify the first or second network access entity as recited in 12, 17, 44 and 46. It is therefore urged that this ground for rejection is traversed.

*The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Agrawal in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20060198372 of Lee (the “Lee” reference). Applicants urge that this ground for rejection is legally incorrect because Lee is not a valid prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).*

Applicants note that Lee was filed on February 21, 2006. This filing date is substantially later than either the February 12, 2004 actual filing date the subject application or its priority date under 35 U.S.C. §119(a) to a corresponding European patent application. Hence, Lee is not a valid prior art reference under either 35 U.S.C. §§102(e) or 103(a). In view of this legal deficiency, the rejection of claims 4 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the combination of Agrawal and Lee is improper and must be removed.


Moreover, even if Lee is a valid prior art reference, the rejection is traversed because the combination of Agrawal and Lee fails to expressly teach every recited limitation of independent claims 1 and 14 and new independent claims 41, 45, and 49

through 54, and therefore, fails to expressly teach every recited limitation of claims 4 and 24 since the dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base independent claims.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David D. Nelson  
Registration No. 47,818

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800; Fax: 703-720-7802

DDN:jkm

Enclosures: Additional Claim Fee Transmittal  
Information Disclosure Statement  
Check No. 16924